Interlocutors prefer to report (rather than withdraw) their answers when they face uncertainty in informal contexts (e.g. conversation with friends) as being informative is regarded important. In formal contexts (e.g. a job interview) people tend to be equally likely to report or withhold their answers in an attempt of being as accurate as possible. The option of preferentially withholding instead of reporting answers in this context was disregarded in our previous study, presumably because participants considered unacceptable not to provide any answer in a job interview. The aim of this research was to further study the underlying decision making process in answer selection. In one experiment participants answered difficult questions, placed in different contexts, and decided in the specificity and report options of their choices while their eye movements were recorded. We found discrepancy between the behavioural results and the proportion of fixations in the possible alternatives challenging the gaze cascade model. In the formal context there were no differences between single reported and plural withheld answers but the former attracted more fixations suggesting that it was the default option although participants opted equally for both trying to increase accuracy. In the informal context, single reported answers attracted a higher amount of fixations but the plural reported was significantly more selected suggesting that participants opted for being informative in this context but also that they tried to maintain the accuracy of their answers. Our results highlight the relevance of using unbiased measures to study the underlying processes in sharing information.
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